



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,053	07/12/2001	Hung-Tien Yu	005552	3453
32588	7590	12/21/2004	EXAMINER	
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. 2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061 SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			LEE, HSIEN MING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2823	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/905,053	Applicant(s) YU ET AL.	
	Examiner Hsien-ming Lee	Art Unit 2823	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6 and 10-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20-23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,13,14,18,24,29 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5,10-12,15-17,19,25-28,31 and 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

HSIEN-MING LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

lee
12/15/2004

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Grounds of Rejections

Claim Objections

1. Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: an indefinite term “30 seconds or **more**” since “more” does not define an upper limit (Emphasis added) Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 13, 14, 18, 24, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Geiger et al. (US 6,733,955)

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

In re claims 1-2, 4, 6, 13, 14, Geiger et al., in Figs. 3-4 and related text, teach the claimed deposition method capable of filling recesses in a substrate, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2823

(a) providing a substrate 224 having recesses 228 defining side walls 232 and recess bottoms 230 (Fig.3A);

(b) exposing the substrate to an energized deposition gas comprising a first component comprising ozone and a second component comprising TEOS (col. 8, lines 12-14), to deposit a first layer of a material in the recess 28 at different rates over the side walls 232 and recess bottoms 230; and

(c) reducing the ratio of the first component (i.e. ozone) to the second component (i.e. TEOS), to deposit a second layer of the material over the first layer in the recess 228, i.e. adjusting the flow rate of the ozone (i.e. O_3) and/or TEOS so that the first layer of the material (i.e. O_3 /TEOS layer), which is located at the lower portion of the recess 228, is deposited at a higher deposition rate and the second layer, which is located at the upper portion of the recess 228, is deposited at a lower deposition rate (col. 8, lines 14-24).

In re claim 18, Geiger et al teach depositing the first layer to a sufficient thickness to fill the reentrance cavities 228.

In re claims 24, 29, and 30, Geiger et al also teach the claimed method of filling recesses or shallow trench 228 with a dielectric material (i.e. O_3 /TEOS layer), the method disposing a substrate 224 defining a recess 228 between raised features into a processing chamber; and comprising:

continuously introducing a deposition gas (i.e. TEOS and ozone) into a processing chamber while gradually changing a relative composition of the deposition gas (i.e. gradually changing the flow rate of ozone and/or TEOS), such that conformality of the dielectric material within the recess decreases, and deposition rate of the dielectric material within the recess

Art Unit: 2823

increases (i.e. to maximize the O₃/TEOS. Ratio to increase the deposition rate from the recess bottom to the recess top, col. 8, lines 26-28).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/15/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The objection to claim 28, as set forth in the previous Office Action, has not been responded by the applicant.

In re 102(e) rejection , applicant argued that Geiger et al. do describe adjusting the flow rates of process gases to achieve specific gas ratio but not teach changing the gas flows to achieve different O₃/TEOS ratios. (first paragraph, page 7).

Contrary to the argument, Geiger et al teach not only adjusting the flow rate to achieve specific ratio but also varying the gas ratio of O₃ versus TEOS. In particular, Geiger et al, in **col. 8, lines 18-24**, disclose **adjusting the flow rate of the ozone (i.e. O₃) and/or TEOS** to deposit a first layer of the material (i.e. O₃/TEOS layer) at the lower portion of the recess 228, wherein the ozone is equivalent to the first component and TEOS is the second component.

For the reason given above, the rejection, as set forth in the previous Office Action, is deemed proper.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 2823

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hsien-ming Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-1863. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday (8:00 ~ 6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on 571-272-1855. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hsien-ming Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2823

Dec. 15, 0224

HSIEN-MING LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

12/15/2004